arXiv:1610.05988v1 [math.NA] 19 Oct 2016

Block-Kronecker Ansatz Spaces for Matrix Polynomials

H. Fassbender*, P. Saltenberger†

October 20, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a new family of equations for matrix pencils that may be utilized for the construction of strong linearizations for any square or rectangluar matrix polynomial. We provide a comprehensive characterization of the resulting vector spaces and show that almost every matrix pencil therein is a strong linearization regardless whether the matrix polynomial under consideration is regular or singular. These novel "ansatz spaces" cover all block-Kronecker pencils as introduced in [3] as a subset and therefore contain all Fiedler pencils modulo permutations. The important case of square matrix polynomials is examined in greater depth. We prove that the intersection of any number of block-Kronecker ansatz spaces is never empty and construct large subspaces of blocksymmetric matrix pencils among which still almost every pencil is a strong linearization. Moreover, we show that the original ansatz spaces $\mathbb{L}_1$ and $\mathbb{L}_2$ may essentially be recovered from block-Kronecker ansatz spaces via pre- and postmultiplication, respectively, of certain constant matrices.

1 Introduction

The linearization of (non) square matrix polynomials $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} P_i\lambda^i, P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ has received much attention in the last ten years, motivated at least in part by the ground-breaking paper [8]. In that paper, three vector spaces $\mathbb{L}_1$, $\mathbb{L}_2$ and $\mathbb{DL}$ of potential linearizations (called "ansatz spaces") for square matrix polynomials $P(\lambda)(m = n)$ have been introduced. The spaces $\mathbb{L}_1$, $\mathbb{L}_2$ generalize the companion form of the first and second kind, resp.,

$$\mathbb{L}_1(P) = \{\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \lambda X + Y \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{nd\times nd} \mid \mathcal{L}(\lambda)\big(\Lambda_{d-1} \otimes I_n\big) = v \otimes P(\lambda), v \in \mathbb{R}^d\}, \quad (1)$$

$\mathbb{L}_2(P) = \{\mathcal{L}(\lambda)^T \mid \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{L}_1(P^T)\}$ while the double ansatz space

$$\mathbb{DL}(P) = \mathbb{L}_1(P) \cap \mathbb{L}_2(P) \quad (2)$$

is their intersection. Here Λ_j is the vector of the elements of the standard basis; $\Lambda_j := \Lambda_j(\lambda) = [\ \lambda^j\ \lambda^{j-1}\ \cdots\ \lambda\ 1\ ]^T \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{j+1}$ for any integer $j \geqslant 0$. A thorough discussion of these spaces can be found in [8] and [6], see [3] for more references. In particular, it is discussed in [8] that almost all pencils in these spaces are linearizations of $P(\lambda)$ and in [6] that any matrix pencil in $\mathbb{DL}(P)$ is blocksymmetric.

The second main source of linearizations are Fiedler pencils $F_\sigma(\lambda)$. Unlike the linearizations from the vector spaces discussed above, these can be defined not only for square, but also for rectangular matrices. These pencils are defined in an implicit way, either in terms of products of matrices for square polynomials or as the output of a symbolic algorithm for rectangular matrices, see [3, Section 4] for a definition, a summary of their properties and references to further work.

*Institut Computational Mathematics, AG Numerik, TU Braunschweig. E-Mail: h.fassbender@tu-bs.de, URL: https://www.tu-braunschweig.de/icm/numerik/personal/fassbender

†Institut Computational Mathematics, AG Numerik, TU Braunschweig. E-Mail: philip.saltenberger@tu-bs.de, URL: https://www.tu-braunschweig.de/icm/numerik/personal/phisalte

In [3, Section 5] the family of block Kronecker pencils is introduced, which include all of the Fiedler pencils (modulo permutations). For an arbitary matrix pencil $M_0 + \lambda M_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)m\times(\epsilon+1)n}$ any matrix pencil of the form

$$\mathcal{N}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} M_0 + \lambda M_1 & L_\eta^T \otimes I_m \\ \hline L_\epsilon \otimes I_n & 0_{\epsilon n\times \eta m} \end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon+1)n+\eta m\times(\eta+1)m+\epsilon n} \tag{3}$$

is called an (ϵ, n, η, m)-block Kronecker pencil, or simply, a block Kronecker pencil. Here,

$$L_\kappa = L_\kappa(\lambda) := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & \lambda & & \\ & -1 & \lambda & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & -1 \quad \lambda \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{\kappa\times\kappa+1}. \tag{4}$$

It is proven that $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$ is a (strong) linearization of the matrix polynomial $Q(\lambda) = (\Lambda_\eta(\lambda)^T \otimes I_m)(M_0 + \lambda M_1)(\Lambda_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n) \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}$ of degreee $d = \epsilon + \eta + 1$.

Inspired by the work in [3], we introduce a new family of equations for matrix pencils that may be applied to square and rectangluar matrix polynomials. Matrix pencils that satisfy one or more particular equation form real vector spaces that are shown to serve as an abundant source of strong linearization. Since these spaces share important properties with $\mathbb{L}_1$ and $\mathbb{L}_2$ and entirely contain all block Kronecker pencils as introduced in [3], we named them "block-Kronecker ansatz spaces". We devote special attention to the investigation of block-Kronecker ansatz spaces for square matrix polynomials. In this case we are able to show that the intersection of any number of block-Kronecker ansatz spaces is never empty. As a main difference to $\mathbb{DL}$, pencils in two or more block-Kronecker ansatz spaces are not blocksymmetric in general but blocksymmetric pencils form proper and large-dimensional subspaces therein. Still almost every matrix pencil, blocksymmetric or not, is a strong linearization. The main purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive introduction of block-Kronecker ansatz spaces, to prove their basic properties and to motivate these features by appropriately selected examples. A deeper study of block-Kronecker ansatz spaces in terms of eigenvalue conditioning and backward error analysis could be a subject of further research.

In Section 2 some basic notation and well-known results are reviewed Section 3 introduces the block-Kronecker ansatz space and its most important properties. Double ansatz spaces and their subspaces of blocksymmetric pencils are considered in Section 4, while Section 5 is concerned with the derivation $\mathbb{L}_1$ and $\mathbb{L}_2$ based on our results and the computation of the standard basis in $\mathbb{DL}$. Some concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

2 Basic Notation

The following notation will be used throughout the paper: I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix, e_i its i-th column and $0_{m\times n}$ denotes the $m \times n$ zero matrix. The Kronecker product of two matrices A and B is denoted $A \otimes B$ whereas the direct product of A and B is $A \oplus B$, i.e. $A \oplus B = \mathrm{diag}(A, B)$. Whenever a $km \times kn$ matrix A may be expressed as $A = \sum_{i,j=1}^k e_i e_j^T \otimes B_{ij}$ for certain $m \times n$ matrices B_{ij}, we call $A^{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^k e_j e_i^T \otimes B_{ij}$ the block-transpose of A (see [6, Def. 2.1]). For $\mathbb{R}[\lambda]$, the ring of real polynomials in the variable λ, the $m \times n$ matrix ring over $\mathbb{R}[\lambda]$ is denoted by $\mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}$. Its elements are referred to as matrix polynomials. Notice that $\mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}$ is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$.

Certainly, a matrix polynomial $P(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}$ may always be expressed as

$$P(\lambda) = P_d\lambda^d + P_{d-1}\lambda^{d-1} + \ldots + P_1\lambda + P_0 = [P_d\ P_{d-1}\ \cdots\ P_0]\Lambda_d \tag{5}$$

for appropriate matrices $P_0, \ldots, P_d \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and some $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

A matrix polynomial $P(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}$ is called regular given the case $m = n$ and $\det(P(\lambda))$ is not identically zero. Otherwise, $P(\lambda)$ is called singular. A regular matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ is said to be unimodular if $\det(P(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{R}$. A scalar $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is referred to as a (finite) eigenvalue of $P(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}$, if $P(z) \in \mathbb{R}[z]^{m\times n} \subset \mathbb{C}^{m\times n}$ is singular. Its corresponding eigenspace is defined to be $\operatorname{null}(P(z))$, the nullspace of $P(z)$.

Two matrix polynomials $P(\lambda)$ and $Q(\lambda)$ are said to be (weakly) equivalent if there exist unimodular matrices $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ such that $P(\lambda) = U(\lambda)Q(\lambda)V(\lambda)$ holds. The equivalence is called strong whenever $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ may be chosen independent of λ. Given in the form (5), the matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ has degree k, i.e. $\deg(P(\lambda)) = k$, whenever $P_k \neq 0$ and $P_i = 0$ for all $i > k$. If $\deg(P(\lambda)) = 1$ we refer to $P(\lambda)$ as a (matrix) pencil. The subspace of all $m \times n$ matrix polynomials having at most degree $d \in \mathbb{N}$ is denoted $\mathbb{R}_d[\lambda]^{m\times n}$. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $P(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}$ the t-reversal of $P(\lambda)$ is defined as the matrix polynomial

$$\operatorname{rev}_t(P(\lambda)) = \lambda^t P\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}. \tag{6}$$

The matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ is said to have an infinite eigenvalue, if zero is an eigenvalue of $\operatorname{rev}_k(P(\lambda))$. The corresponding eigenspace is $\operatorname{null}(\operatorname{rev}_k(P(0)))$.

2.1 Linearizations of Matrix Polynomials

A matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is said to be a linearization of $P(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{m\times n}$ if there exist two unimodular matrix polynomials $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ such that

$$U(\lambda)\mathcal{L}(\lambda)V(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_s & \\ \hline & P(\lambda) \end{array}\right] \tag{7}$$

holds for some $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, assuming $\deg(P(\lambda)) = k$, the linearization $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is called strong whenever $\operatorname{rev}_1(\mathcal{L}(\lambda))$ is a linearization for $\operatorname{rev}_k(P(\lambda))$ as well. It is a basic fact on strong linearizations that they preserve the finite and infinite elementary divisors of $P(\lambda)$ (see [3, Def. 2.13], the information and the references given there for more details). In particular, any strong linearization $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ of $P(\lambda)$ has the same (finite and infinite) eigenvalues as $P(\lambda)$ and keeps on their algebraic and geometric multiplicities.

Given an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i\lambda^i$ of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) = k$, it is well known, that the Frobenius companion form

$$\operatorname{Frob}_P(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} P_k & & & \\ & I_n & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & I_n \end{bmatrix}\lambda + \begin{bmatrix} P_{k-1} & \cdots & P_1 & P_0 \\ -I_n & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & -I_n & \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_1[\lambda]^{kn\times kn}$$

is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ no matter whether $P(\lambda)$ is regular or singular. Moreover, notice that (strong) equivalence preserves (strong) linearizations. Notice that according to (7) any matrix pencil is its own linearization. Thus, the notion of linearization does hardly make sense for matrix pencils. Since the construction of linearizations is our main concern throughout the paper, we will henceforth assume arbirtrary matrix polynomials $P(\lambda)$ having degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) \geq 2$ to avoid the potential occurrence of pathological cases.

3 Block-Kronecker Ansatz Spaces

The following definition introduces the main object of interest throughout the remaining paper. We will consistently assume ϵ and η to be nonnegative integers.

Definition 1 (Block-Kronecker Ansatz Equation).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $m \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$. We define $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ to be the set of all $(\eta+1)m + \epsilon n \times (\epsilon+1)n + \eta m$ matrix pencils $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ satisfying

$$\big((\Lambda_\eta^T \otimes I_m) \oplus I_{\epsilon n}\big)\mathcal{L}(\lambda)\big((\Lambda_\epsilon \otimes I_n) \oplus I_{\eta m}\big) = \alpha P(\lambda) \oplus 0_{\epsilon n \times \eta m} \tag{8}$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Equation (8) is called block-Kronecker ansatz equation for $P(\lambda)$.

We will refer to $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ as a "block-Kronecker ansatz space" for $P(\lambda)$. This name was chosen in compliment of the "ansatz spaces" established in [8] and the "block Kronecker pencils" introduced in [3]. How the main ideas of both papers may be unified via the concept of block-Kronecker ansatz spaces is one primary concern of this paper. Notice that, since η may take any integer value between 0 and $k-1$, there always exist exactly k block-Kronecker ansatz spaces for $P(\lambda)$.

Lemma 2 ($\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a $\mathbb{R}$-vector space). *For any $m \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$, $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$.*

Since the statement of Lemma 2 is quite obvious, we omit the proof. Rather notice that equation (8) may be reformulated as

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} \Lambda_\eta^T \otimes I_m & 0 \\ \hline 0 & I_{\epsilon n} \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda) & \mathcal{L}_{12}(\lambda) \\ \hline \mathcal{L}_{21}(\lambda) & \mathcal{L}_{22}(\lambda) \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \Lambda_\epsilon \otimes I_n & 0 \\ \hline 0 & I_{\eta m} \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha P(\lambda) & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0_{\epsilon n \times \eta m} \end{array}\right] \tag{9}$$

where we have expressed $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ as a 2×2 block matrix with $\mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)m \times (\epsilon+1)n}$. Following [3, Def. 5.1], this structured 2×2 block-notation of a pencil in $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is called its natural partition. In terms of this expression, (9) explicitely reads

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} (\Lambda_\eta^T \otimes I_m)\mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda)(\Lambda_\epsilon \otimes I_n) & (\Lambda_\eta^T \otimes I_m)\mathcal{L}_{12}(\lambda) \\ \hline \mathcal{L}_{21}(\lambda)(\Lambda_\epsilon \otimes I_n) & \mathcal{L}_{22}(\lambda) \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha P(\lambda) & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0_{\epsilon n \times \eta m} \end{array}\right]. \tag{10}$$

For $(\Lambda_\eta^T \otimes I_m)\mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda)(\Lambda_\epsilon \otimes I_n)$ we will steadily be using the short hand notation $\Phi(\mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda))$ assuming the parameters involved in this expression are clear from the context. For instance, (10) implies $\Phi(\mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda)) = \alpha P(\lambda)$.

Next we will consider the off-diagonal blocks of (10). Recall the definiton of L_κ (4) and notice that $L_\kappa \Lambda_\kappa = 0$, so L_κ and Λ_κ are dual minimal bases [3, Sec. 2]. Consequently $(L_\kappa \otimes I_n)(\Lambda_\kappa \otimes I_n) = 0$ (see also [3, Ex. 2.6]).

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ be an $\kappa_1 m \times (\kappa_2+1)n$ matrix pencil and assume*

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda)\big(\Lambda_{\kappa_2}(\lambda) \otimes I_n\big) = 0_{\kappa_1 m \times n}. \tag{11}$$

Then $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = C(L_{\kappa_2}(\lambda) \otimes I_n)$ for some matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa_1 m \times \kappa_2 n}$.

Proof. Assume $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = \lambda[\, k_1 \mid K_1 \,] + K_0$ with $k_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa_1 m \times n}$ satisfies (11). Then

$$\Delta\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = \mathcal{K}(\lambda) - K_1(L_{\kappa_2}(\lambda) \otimes I_n) =: [\, d_1(\lambda) \mid D_1 \,]$$

is independent of λ in all but its first block-column $d_1(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}_1[\lambda]^{\kappa_1 m \times n}$. However, $\Delta\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ still satisfies (11). Due to the basis property of the monomials $1, \lambda, \lambda^2, \ldots$ this implies $\Delta\mathcal{K}(\lambda) \equiv 0$. □

Further on, via block transposition it can be seen that any $(\kappa_1+1)m \times \kappa_2 n$ pencil $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ satisfying $(\Lambda_{\kappa_1}^T \otimes I_m)\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = 0$ has an expression $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = (L_{\kappa_1}^T \otimes I_m)C$ for some matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa_1 m \times \kappa_2 n}$. Hence, regarding (10) once more, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{21}(\lambda) = C_1\big(L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n\big) \qquad \mathcal{L}_{12}(\lambda) = \big(L_\eta^T(\lambda) \otimes I_m\big)C_2 \tag{12}$$

for matrices $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\epsilon n \times \epsilon n}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta m \times \eta m}$. Now, considering again the $(1,1)$-block in (10) and an $m \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i \lambda^i$ of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$, observe that the $(\eta+1)m \times (\epsilon+1)n$ matrix pencil

$$\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda P_k + P_{k-1} & P_{k-2} & \cdots & P_\eta \\ & & & P_{\eta-1} \\ & & 0_{\eta m \times \epsilon n} & \vdots \\ & & & P_0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{13}$$

satisfies $\Phi(\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda)) = P(\lambda)$. Therefore, for any other $(\eta+1)m \times (\epsilon+1)n$ pencil $Q(\lambda)$ satisfying $\Phi(Q(\lambda)) = \alpha P(\lambda)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we obtain

$$\Phi\big(\alpha\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda) - Q(\lambda)\big) = \alpha\Phi\big(\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda)\big) - \Phi\big(Q(\lambda)\big) = \alpha P(\lambda) - \alpha P(\lambda) = 0.$$

Thus, interpreting Φ as a function mapping $(\eta+1)m \times (\epsilon+1)n$ matrix pencils to $m \times n$ matrix polynomials $P(\lambda)$ of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) \leq \epsilon + \eta + 1$, Φ is linear. Moreover, Φ is easily seen to be surjective. The homomorphism theorem gives

$$\mathbb{R}_1[\lambda]^{(\eta+1)m \times (\epsilon+1)n} / \mathrm{null}(\Phi) \;\cong\; \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon+\eta+1}[\lambda]^{m \times n} \tag{14}$$

and thus $\dim(\mathrm{null}(\Phi)) = \big(\eta(\epsilon+1) + (\eta+1)\epsilon\big)mn$.

Now note that all $(\eta+1)m \times (\epsilon+1)n$ matrix pencils $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ having the form

$$\mathcal{M}(\lambda) = B_1\big(L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n\big) + \big(L_\eta^T(\lambda) \otimes I_m\big)B_2 \tag{15}$$

for arbitrary matrices $B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)m \times \epsilon n}$ and $B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta m \times (\epsilon+1)n}$ form a real vector space of dimension $(\eta(\epsilon+1) + (\eta+1)\epsilon)mn$ that is completely contained in $\mathrm{null}(\Phi)$. Therefore we obtain the following characterization of $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$.

THEOREM 4 (Characterization of $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ an $m \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \eta + \epsilon + 1$. Then $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ having dimension

$$\dim(\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)) = (\epsilon n + \eta m)^2 + (\epsilon + \eta)mn + 1. \tag{16}$$

Any matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ may be characterized as

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda) + B_1(L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n) + (L_\eta(\lambda)^T \otimes I_m)B_2 & (L_\eta(\lambda)^T \otimes I_m)C_2 \\ \hline C_1(L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n) & 0 \end{array}\right] \tag{17}$$

with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and some matrices $B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)m \times \epsilon n}, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta m \times (\epsilon+1)n}$, $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\epsilon n \times \epsilon n}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta m \times \eta m}$.

The dimension of $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is just the sum of the dimensions of the constant matrices in expression (17) plus one for the scalar α. Moreover, note that any matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ of the form (17) can be factorized uniquely as

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\eta+1)m} & B_1 \\ \hline 0 & C_1 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & L_\eta(\lambda)^T \otimes I_m \\ \hline L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n & 0 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & 0 \\ \hline B_2 & C_2 \end{array}\right]. \tag{18}$$

EXAMPLE 5. *Let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{6} P_i \lambda^i$ be an $m \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) = 6$ and consider the case $\eta = 3, \epsilon = 2$. According to (17) we may construct the following matrix pencil*

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \lambda P_6 + P_5 & P_4 & P_3 & 0 & -P_1P_1^T & 6I_m \\ A & -(B + \lambda A) & P_2 & 0 & P_2P_2^T + \lambda P_1P_1^T & -6\lambda I_m \\ -P_3 & \lambda B & P_1 & D & -\lambda P_2P_2^T & 0 \\ \lambda P_3 & 0 & P_0 & -\lambda D & 0 & 0 \\ \hline C & -(P_0^TP_0 + \lambda C) & \lambda P_0^TP_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C & -\lambda C & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]$$

with arbitrary matrices A, B, C and D. Notice that $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ whereas $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_4(P)$ since $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ may be expressed in the form (18) with

$$\begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ C_1 \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ -A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \\ -C & P_0^T P_0 \\ 0 & -C \end{array}\right] \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} B_2 & C_2 \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & P_1 P_1^T & -6I_m \\ 0 & B & 0 & 0 & -P_2 P_2^T & 0 \\ P_3 & 0 & 0 & -D & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]$$

and $\alpha = 1$. As the next theorem will reveal, $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ if $P_2 P_2^T, C$ and D are all regular. In the case of $P(\lambda)$ being square and regular, these three conditions turn out to be sufficient and necessary for $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ being a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$. Suprisingly, the choice of A and B does not have any effect in that regard.

The next theorem presents a quite natural linearization condition for matrix pencils in block-Kronecker ansatz spaces. Notice that we a priori do not require $P(\lambda)$ to be regular or even square.

THEOREM 6 (Linearization Condition for $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $m \times n$ matrix polynomial and $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ as in (18). Then $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ if $\alpha \neq 0$ and

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\eta+1)m} & B_1 \\ \hline 0 & C_1 \end{array}\right] \in \mathrm{GL}_{(\eta+1)m+\epsilon n}(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & 0 \\ \hline B_2 & C_2 \end{array}\right] \in \mathrm{GL}_{(\epsilon+1)n+\eta m}(\mathbb{R}). \tag{19}$$

Certainly (19) is equivalent to $\det(C_1), \det(C_2) \neq 0$.

Proof. Assuming the matrices

$$U = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\eta+1)m} & B_1 \\ \hline 0 & C_1 \end{array}\right] \text{ and } V = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & 0 \\ \hline B_2 & C_2 \end{array}\right] \tag{20}$$

are regular, $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in (18) is strongly equivalent to

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\eta,P}(\lambda) := \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & L_\eta(\lambda)^T \otimes I_m \\ \hline L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{21}$$

According to [3, Thm. 5.2] the matrix pencil $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\eta,P}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $\alpha P(\lambda)$. Thus $\alpha \neq 0$ implies $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\eta,P}(\lambda)$ to be a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$, so $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ as well. □

REMARK 7. *Given the case of a regular $n \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$, the statement in Theorem 6 becomes an equivalence. In fact, if $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ as in (18) is a strong linearization for some regular $P(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ necessarily is regular. This implies the matrices U and V to be regular and the scalar α to be nonzero.*

In [8, Thm. 4.7] and [2, Thm. 4.4] it was shown that almost every pencil in $\mathbb{L}_1(P)$ (and $\mathbb{L}_2(P)$) is a strong linearization for the (regular or singular) square matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$. Here, a similar statement holds for $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and rectangular, i.e. not necessarily square matrix polynomials $P(\lambda)$.

THEOREM 8 (Linearizations are Generic in $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be a $m \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$. Then almost every matrix pencil in $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$.

Theorem 8 follows directly from Theorem 6 since $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathrm{GL}_{\epsilon n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathrm{GL}_{\eta m}(\mathbb{R})$ are dense subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}^{\epsilon n \times \epsilon n}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{\eta m \times \eta m}$ respectively. Using [3, Thm. 5.2], we now prove the *Strong Linearization Theorem* for block-Kronecker ansatz spaces in the style of [8, Thm. 4.3]. Showing the connection between the linearization property and the regularity of matrix pencils, we necessarily focus on regular (i.e. square) matrix polynomials.

THEOREM 9 (Strong Linearization Theorem for $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ regular matrix polynomial and $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$. Then the following statements are equivalent

1. *$\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a linearization for $P(\lambda)$.*
2. *$\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a regular matrix pencil.*
3. *$\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Since 3. $\Rightarrow$ 1. $\Rightarrow$ 2. is obvious, we only need to show 2. $\Rightarrow$ 3.
Assume $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in (18) to be regular. This certainly requires the regularity of U and V as in (20) and consequently implies the regularity of $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\eta,P}(\lambda)$. Now suppose $\alpha = 0$. Then the ansatz equation (8) gives

$$\mathcal{F}_{0,\eta,P}(\lambda)\big((\Lambda_\epsilon \otimes I_n) \oplus I_{\eta n}\big)e_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad e_j^T\big((\Lambda_\eta^T \otimes I_n) \oplus I_{\epsilon n}\big)\mathcal{F}_{0,\eta,P} = 0$$

for any $1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n$. This shows that $\mathcal{F}_{0,\eta,P}(\lambda)$ can not be regular, a contradiction. Therefore, the assumption of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(\lambda)$ being regular implies $\alpha \neq 0$ and thus the validity of all three conditions in Theorem 6. □

The next theorem shows that the eigenvector recovery for pencils in $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is as easy as for block-Kronecker pencils [3, Section 7].

THEOREM 10. *Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ regular matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$ and $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$. Then the following statements hold (with $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$)*

1. *If $u \in \mathbb{C}^{kn}$ is a right eigenvector of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ with finite eigenvalue $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$, then $u^\star = (e_{\epsilon+1}^T \otimes I_n)u$ is a right eigenvector of $P(\lambda)$ with finite eigenvalue β.*
2. *If $u \in \mathbb{C}^{kn}$ is a right eigenvector of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ with eigenvalue ∞, then $(e_1^T \otimes I_n)u$ is a right eigenvector of $P(\lambda)$ with eigenvalue ∞.*
3. *If $y \in \mathbb{C}^{kn}$ is a left eigenvector of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ with finite eigenvalue $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$, then $y^\star = (e_{\eta+1}^T \otimes I_n)y$ is a left eigenvector of $P(\lambda)$ with finite eigenvalue β.*
4. *If $y \in \mathbb{C}^{kn}$ is a left eigenvector of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ with eigenvalue ∞, then $(e_1^T \otimes I_n)y$ is a left eigenvector of $P(\lambda)$ with eigenvalue ∞.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is given as in (18), i.e. $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = U\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\eta,P}(\lambda)V$ using the notation of (20) and (21). Now assume $u \in \mathbb{C}^{kn}\backslash\{0\}$ satisfies $\mathcal{L}(\beta)u = 0$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$. Then $u^\star = \frac{1}{\alpha}Vu$ is a right eigenvector of $\mathcal{F}_{1,\eta,P}(\lambda)$ (recall that U is regular, i.e. $\operatorname{null}(U) = \emptyset$). Applying [3, Thm. 7.6] yields that $(e_{\epsilon+1}^T \otimes I_n)u^\star$ is a right eigenvector of $P(\lambda)$ with eigenvalue β. Now a closer look reveals $(e_{\epsilon+1}^T \otimes I_n)u^\star = (e_{\epsilon+1}^T \otimes I_n)u$ due to the form of V. Thus $P(\beta)(e_{\epsilon+1}^T \otimes I_n)u = 0$. The remaining statements follow by exactly the same argumentation. □

Next, we provide a comprehensive example on block-Kronecker pencils and their connection to block-Kronecker ansatz spaces.

EXAMPLE 11 (Block-Kronecker Pencils).
Consider the set of matrix pencils $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ having the form (18) with $\alpha = 1$, $C_1 = I_{\epsilon n}$ and $C_2 = I_{\eta m}$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\lambda) &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\eta+1)m} & B_1 \\ \hline 0 & I_{\epsilon n} \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & L_\eta(\lambda)^T \otimes I_m \\ \hline L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n & 0 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & 0 \\ \hline B_2 & I_{\eta n} \end{array}\right] \\ &= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda) + B_1(L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n) + (L_\eta(\lambda)^T \otimes I_m)B_2 & (L_\eta(\lambda)^T \otimes I_m) \\ \hline (L_\epsilon(\lambda) \otimes I_n) & 0 \end{array}\right].\end{aligned}$$

These matrix pencils coincide with the family of (ϵ, n, η, m)-block-Kronecker pencils (3). Notice that every such pencil is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ according to [3, Thm. 5.2], which complies with Theorem 6 since in this case $\alpha \neq 0$ and C_1 and C_2 are regular.

REMARK 12. *For any arbitrary $m \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$, all (ϵ, n, η, m)-block-Kronecker pencils are elements of $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$, but they only form a subset, not a subspace of $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$.*

It is stated in [3, Sec. 4.2] that for any Fiedler pencil $F_\sigma(\lambda)$ there exist two permutation matrices Π_1 and Π_2 such that $\Pi_1 F_\sigma(\lambda)\Pi_2$ is a block-Kronecker pencil. Therefore we may argue that block-Kronecker ansatz spaces contain all block-Kronecker pencils and - modulo permutations - all Fiedler pencils. Therefore, based on [3], we succeeded in bringing together Fiedler companion linearizations and ansatz spaces for the first time. Moreover, we were able to make the idea of ansatz spaces, available for rectangluar matrix polynomials. However, notice that block-Kronecker ansatz spaces contain infinitely many more matrix pencils then just permuted Fiedler or block-Kronecker pencils. To this, it is a basic fact that every finite dimensional vector space as $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$, is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Inasmuch as $\mathbb{R}^N$ features a great many of analytical and topological properties, (18) strongly suggests to define these concepts for $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is terms of the pre- and postmultiplicated matrices and the scalar α. Taking this point of view, we may argue that the set of (ϵ, n, η, m)-block-Kronecker pencils constitues a connected and nowhere dense subset in $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$.

4 Double block-Kronecker Ansatz Spaces $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$

In this section we characterize matrix pencils that belong to two or more block-Kronecker ansatz spaces simultaneously. Since this scheme does hardly seem promising in the case $m \neq n$, we confine ourselves to square matrix polynomials.

This study is motivated by the double ansatz space $\mathbb{DL}(P)$ (2). For any regular matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ almost all pencils in $\mathbb{DL}(P)$ are linearizations of $P(\lambda)$ [8, Theorem 6.8], while for singular $P(\lambda)$ none is a linearization [2]. Moreover, any matrix pencil in $\mathbb{DL}(P)$ is blocksymmetric which is in general not true for pencils in double block-Kronecker ansatz spaces.

DEFINITION 13 (Double block-Kronecker Ansatz Space).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be a $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$ and assume $\eta \leqslant \epsilon$. Then we define

$$\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P) := \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P) \cap \mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P). \tag{22}$$

Given an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$, w.l.o.g. we will always assume $\eta \leqslant \epsilon = k - \eta - 1$ from now. This is reasonable since

$$\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P) = \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P) \cap \mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P) = \mathbb{G}_{k-\epsilon}(P) \cap \mathbb{G}_{\epsilon+1}(P) = \mathbb{DG}_{\epsilon+1}(P).$$

Notice further that $\eta + 1 = k - \eta$ implies $k = 2\eta + 1$. Therefore, the special case $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P) = \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P) \cap \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ can only occur for $P(\lambda)$ having odd degree.

Consider the following motivating example.

EXAMPLE 14. *Let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{6} P_i \lambda^i$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree* $\deg(P(\lambda)) = 6$ *and consider the case $\eta = 0$. Then*

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|cccc} \lambda P_6 + P_5 & P_4 & P_3 & P_2 & P_1 & P_0 \\ \hline P_4 & P_3 - \lambda P_4 & P_2 - \lambda P_3 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 \\ P_3 & P_2 - \lambda P_3 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 \\ P_2 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 \\ P_1 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ P_0 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right] \tag{23}$$

is an element of $\mathbb{DG}_1(P) = \mathbb{G}_1(P) \cap \mathbb{G}_6(P)$[1]. Notice further that $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a blocksymmetric pencil.

[1] A closer look at the block-Kronecker ansatz equation reveals, that $\mathbb{DG}_1(P)$ coincides with the subspace of all matrix pencils having a multiple of e_1 as ansatz vector in $\mathbb{DL}(P)$. We restrain the study of the connection between the classical ansatz spaces $\mathbb{L}_1, \mathbb{L}_2$ and $\mathbb{DL}$ and our approach to Section 5.

Now consider the case $\eta = 1$ and the matrix pencil

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{cc:c:ccc:c} \lambda P_6 + P_5 & P_4 & A & 0 & -B & -I_n \\ 0 & P_3 & P_2 - \lambda A & P_1 & P_0 + \lambda B & \lambda I_n \\ \hdashline 0 & P_2 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 \\ C & P_1 - \lambda C & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_0 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -I_n & \lambda I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{24}$$

with arbitrary $n \times n$ matrices A, B, C. It is readily checked that $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_2(P)$, i.e. $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ is an element of $\mathbb{G}_2(P)$ and $\mathbb{G}_5(P)$ simultaneously. Anyhow, it is obvious that $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ is not blocksymmetric.

Example 14 shows that double block-Kronecker ansatz spaces $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ need not contain exclusively blocksymmetric pencils. Albeit, they are never empty and the following theorem gives a comprehensive characterization of these spaces. To this end, we introduce a truncated square version of $\Sigma_{\eta,P}(\lambda)$, namely

$$\Sigma^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda P_k + P_{k-1} & \cdots & P_\epsilon \\ & & \vdots \\ & & P_{\epsilon-\eta} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{(\eta+1)n \times (\eta+1)n}$$

and set $\Pi^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) := \left[\, \Sigma^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) \; \mathcal{R}_{\eta,P} \,\right] \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{(\eta+1)n \times (\epsilon+1)n}$ with

$$\mathcal{R}_{\eta,P} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} 0_{\eta n \times (\epsilon-\eta)n} & & \\ \hline P_{\epsilon-\eta-1} & \cdots & P_0 \end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)n \times (\epsilon-\eta)n}.$$

Moreover, for $\epsilon \geqslant \eta$ we define the Hankel matrix

$$\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta}(P) = \begin{bmatrix} -P_{\epsilon-\eta-1} & \cdots & -P_1 & -P_0 \\ \vdots & \iddots & \iddots & \\ -P_1 & -P_0 & & \\ -P_0 & & & \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon-\eta)n \times (\epsilon-\eta)n}. \tag{25}$$

Notice that this Hankel structure already showed up in the construction of symmetric linearizations in [6]. We obtain the following theorem.

THEOREM 15 (Characterization of $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$ and assume $\eta \leqslant \epsilon$. Then $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ having dimension

$$\dim\big(\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)\big) = 2k\eta n^2 + 1. \tag{26}$$

Any matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ may be characterized as

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} I_{(\eta+1)n} & B_{11} & 0_{(\eta+1)\times(\epsilon-\eta)n} \\ \hline 0 & C_{11} & \alpha\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta} \\ \hline 0 & C_{21} & 0_{\eta n \times (\epsilon-\eta)n} \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Pi^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & L_\eta^T \otimes I_n \\ \hline L_\epsilon \otimes I_n & 0 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & 0 \\ \hline B_2 & C_2 \end{array}\right] \tag{27}$$

with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and some matrices $B_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)n \times \eta n}$, $C_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon-\eta)n \times \eta n}$, $C_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta n \times \eta n}$, $B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta n \times (\epsilon+1)n}$ and $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta n \times \eta n}$. Moreover, $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a proper subspace of both $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and $\mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P)$.

Proof. Assume $P(\lambda)$ to be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$ with $\eta \leqslant \epsilon$ and $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ to be a $kn \times kn$ matrix pencil in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$. Now consider $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ partioned as a 3×3 block matrix as indicated in Figure 1 as well as in its natural



Figure 1: $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ in its natural 3×3 partitioning. This partitioning may be interpreted as the overlay of the natural partitionings of elements in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and $\mathbb{DG}_{k-\eta}(P)$

partioning as a matrix pencil in $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ in (9). The leading block $\mathcal{L}^\star_{11}(\lambda)$ is rectangular of size $(\eta+1)n\times(\epsilon+1)n$, this corresponds to the $(1,1)$ and the $(1,2)$ block in the 3×3 partioning in Figure 1. Clearly, the $(1,3)$ block corresponds to $\mathcal{L}^\star_{12}(\lambda)$, that is equal to $(L_\eta(\lambda)^T\otimes I_n)C_2$ for a matrix $C_2\in\mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times\eta n}$. Moreover, from (17) it is obvious that $\mathcal{L}^\star_{22}(\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^{\epsilon n\times\eta n}$ is zero, thus the blocks $(2,3)$ and $(3,3)$ in Figure 1 are zero. Now consider $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ in its natural partioning as a matrix pencil in $\mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P)$. Then the block $\mathcal{L}^\star_{11}(\lambda)$ is rectangular of size $(\epsilon+1)n\times(\eta+1)n$, this corresponds to the $(1,1)$ and the $(2,1)$ block in the 3×3 partioning in Figure 1. Obviously, the $(3,1)$ block corresponds here to $\mathcal{L}^\star_{21}(\lambda)$, which is given as $C_{21}(L_\eta(\lambda)\otimes I_n)$ for a matrix $C_{21}\in\mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times\eta n}$. As before, the block $\mathcal{L}^\star_{22}(\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times\epsilon n}$ is zero, hence the blocks $(3,2)$ and $(3,3)$ in Figure 1 are zero. Thus, the fact of $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ being an element of $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and of $\mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P)$ a priori implies the unalterable zero structure of $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ in the blocks $(2,3),(3,2)$ and $(3,3)$ of the 3×3 partioning as indicated in grey in Figure 1. In summary, we have identified all of the eight bording blocks in Figure 1. The remaining $(2,2)$-block in the 3×3 partioning, termed "core part" $C(\mathcal{L}^\star)$ of $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ in the following, is square of size $(\epsilon-\eta)n\times(\epsilon-\eta)n$. Our next step is to construct a pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ of the form

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda)=\left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} I_{(\eta+1)n} & B_{11} & 0\\ \hline 0 & C_{11} & C_{12}\\ \hline 0 & C_{21} & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha[\,\Sigma^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda)\;\;0\,] & L_\eta^T\otimes I_n\\ \hline L_\epsilon\otimes I_n & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & 0\\ \hline B_2 & C_2\end{array}\right],$$

such that the bordering blocks in $\Delta\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda):=\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)-\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ get almost entirely eliminated. In fact, we may archieve that $\Delta\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ has the form indicated in Figure 2 by making the appropriate choices of $C_{21},C_2\in\mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times\eta n}$ as described above and finding suitable matrices $B_{11}\in\mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)n\times\eta n}, C_{11}\in\mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon-\eta)n\times\eta n}$, $C_{12}\in\mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon-\eta)n\times(\epsilon-\eta)n}$, and $B_2\in\mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times(\epsilon+1)n}$. That the core part of $\Delta\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ is equal to the core part $C(\mathcal{L}^\star)$ of $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ is achieved by setting the C_{12}-block of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ as $0_{(\epsilon-\eta)n}$. Furthermore, there is a leftover matrix $h^\star\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times(\epsilon-\eta)n}$ in the block (1,2) that can not be eliminated by B_2.

Now consider the natural 2×2 block partition of $\Delta\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ as an element of $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and in particular $\Delta\mathcal{L}^\star_{11}(\lambda)$ (which corresponds to the $(1,1)$ and $(1,2)$ block in Figure 2). Due to the linearity of Φ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi\big(\Delta\mathcal{L}^\star_{11}(\lambda)\big)&=\Phi(\mathcal{L}^\star_{11}(\lambda))-\alpha\Phi([\,\Sigma^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda)\;0_{(\eta+1)n\times(\epsilon-\eta)n}\,])\\&=\alpha P(\lambda)-\alpha\Big(\sum_{i=\epsilon-\eta}^{k}P_i\lambda^i\Big)=\alpha\sum_{i=0}^{\epsilon-\eta-1}P_i\lambda^i.\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

Considering once again Figure 2, this immediately implies $h^\star=[\,\alpha P_{\epsilon-\eta-1}\;\cdots\;\alpha P_0\,]$. Therefore, if we had chosen $\alpha\Pi^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda)$ instead of $\alpha[\,\Sigma^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda)\;0_{(\eta+1)n\times(\epsilon+1)n}\,]$, $h^\star$ would have also been deleted in $\Delta\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ as desired.



Figure 2: $\Delta\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ in its natural 3×3 partition.

Now, since the $(\epsilon-\eta)n \times (\epsilon-\eta)n$ core part $C(\mathcal{L}^\star)$ of $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ has to be reproducable in both block-Kronecker ansatz spaces, the choice $h^\star = [\,\alpha P_{\epsilon-\eta-1} \;\cdots\; \alpha P_0\,]$ unexpectedly determines $C(\mathcal{L}^\star)$ completely. The unique possible form for $C(\mathcal{L}^\star)$ is

$$C(\mathcal{L}^\star) = \alpha \begin{bmatrix} P_{\mu-1} - \lambda P_\mu & P_{\mu-2} - \lambda P_{\mu-1} & \cdots & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 \\ P_{\mu-2} - \lambda P_{\mu-1} & P_{\mu-3} - \lambda P_{\mu-2} & \iddots & \iddots & \\ \vdots & \iddots & \iddots & & \\ P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & & & \\ -\lambda P_0 & & & & \end{bmatrix}$$

where we have set $\mu := \epsilon - \eta - 1$ for abbreviation. Exactly this matrix pencil is obtained by setting $C_{12} = \alpha\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta}(P)$. Therefore, we have shown that $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ may be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} I_{(\eta+1)n} & B_{11} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & C_{11} & \alpha\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta} \\ \hline 0 & C_{21} & 0 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Pi^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & L_\eta^T \otimes I_n \\ \hline L_\epsilon \otimes I_n & 0 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & 0 \\ \hline B_2 & C_2 \end{array}\right]$$

which proves the statement. □

Corollary 16 (Non-Emptyness of $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \eta + \epsilon + 1$ and assume $\eta \leqslant \epsilon$. Then

$$\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P) \neq \emptyset. \tag{29}$$

Recall the first case considered in Example 14. Note that Theorem 15 shows that $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ as in (23) is - modulo scalar multiplication - the only matrix pencil in $\mathbb{DG}_1(P)$ since we have $\dim(\mathbb{DG}_1(P)) = 1$ according to (26). Thus $\mathbb{DG}_1(P)$ consists entirely of blocksymmetric pencils.[2] Regarding linearizations, the following fact can immediately be derived from Theorem 6 and Theorem 9 (see also Remark 7).

Theorem 17 (Linearization Condition for $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ for a square and regular matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$. If $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is given in the form (27) the following statements are equivalent:

1. *$\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$.*
2. *$P_0 \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R}), C_{21} \in \mathrm{GL}_{\eta n}(\mathbb{R}), C_2 \in \mathrm{GL}_{\eta n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$.*

[2] This is not surprising since $\mathbb{DG}_1(P)$ coincides with the subset of matrix pencils having a multiple of e_1 as ansatz vector in $\mathbb{DL}(P)$. The vector space $\mathbb{DL}(P)$ contains entirely blocksymmetric pencils. This was shown in [6].

EXAMPLE 18 (Block-Kronecker Pencils). *Notice that a pure block-Kronecker pencil (3) can never be an element of a double block-Kronecker ansatz space*

$$\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P) = \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P) \cap \mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P)$$

for any matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ unless $\eta+1 = k-\eta$. Figuratively speaking, we need some connection between $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and $\mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P)$ to make a pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ element of both spaces. The core part

$$C(\mathcal{L}) = \begin{bmatrix} P_{\mu-1} - \lambda P_\mu & P_{\mu-2} - \lambda P_{\mu-1} & \cdots & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 \\ P_{\mu-2} - \lambda P_{\mu-1} & P_{\mu-3} - \lambda P_{\mu-2} & \iddots & \iddots & \\ \vdots & \iddots & \iddots & & \\ P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & & & \\ -\lambda P_0 & & & & \end{bmatrix}$$

with $\mu := \epsilon - \eta - 1$ takes on this task. Modulo a scalar multiplication, every pencil in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ has the same core part, so it does essentially not depend on the specific pencil but on the matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$. Moreover, $C(\mathcal{L})$ is blocksymmetric. This blocksymmetry turns out to be an important property of pencils in double block-Kronecker ansatz spaces and is further studied in the next section. Notice that, given the case $\eta + 1 = k - \eta$, the core part vanishes entirely and no further restrictions remain for $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$. Only in this situation we obtain pure block-Kronecker pencils.

Consider once again Theorem 17. The compliance of the irrevocable condition $P_0 \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ depends exclusively on the matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$ and holds if and only if zero is not an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$. On the other hand, the conditions $C_{21}, C_2 \in \mathrm{GL}_{\eta n}(\mathbb{R})$ are satisfied for almost every matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{\eta n \times \eta n}$. Since the implication 2. $\Rightarrow$ 1. in Theorem 17 holds without the assumption of regularity (according to Theorem 6), we obtain the following general denseness property.

COROLLARY 19 (Linearizations are Generic in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be a square matrix polynomial and assume zero is not an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$. Then almost every matrix pencil in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$.

REMARK 20. *Assume $\eta = 0$ and consider $\mathbb{DG}_1(P)$. Then Theorem 17 reduces to the Eigenvalue Exclusion Theorem (see [8, Thm. 6.7]) which is a powerful tool in the study of the space $\mathbb{DL}(P)$. It states in this particular case, that $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_1(P)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ if and only if no root of the v-polynomial*

$$p(\lambda; \alpha e_1) = \alpha \lambda^{k-1}$$

(see [8, Def. 6.1]) is an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$. Since 0 is the only root of $p(\lambda; \alpha e_1)$ this means that $P(0) = P_0$ has to be regular, i.e. $P_0 \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, because the matrices C_{21} and C_2 vanish completely (see (23) in Example 14) this is the only condition to hold for $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_1(P)$ being a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$.

4.1 The Superpartition Principle

Although double block-Kronecker ansatz spaces usually do not contain solely blocksymmetric pencils, they possess a remarkable feature that we call "superpartition property". To its motivation, consider the following example.

EXAMPLE 21. *Let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{6} P_i \lambda^i$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) = 6$. Consider once again the case $\eta = 1$ ($\epsilon = 4$) and the matrix pencil $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ from Example*

14:

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{cc|ccc:c} \lambda P_6 + P_5 & P_4 & A & 0 & -B & -I_n \\ 0 & P_3 & P_2 - \lambda A & P_1 & P_0 + \lambda B & \lambda I_n \\ \hdashline 0 & P_2 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 \\ C & P_1 - \lambda C & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_0 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -I_n & \lambda I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{30}$$

As we know, $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_2(P)$, i.e. $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ is an element of $\mathbb{G}_2(P)$ and $\mathbb{G}_5(P)$ simultaneously. Now consider $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ in the slightly modified partitioned form

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c:cc} \lambda P_6 + P_5 & P_4 & A & 0 & -B & -I_n \\ 0 & P_3 & P_2 - \lambda A & P_1 & P_0 + \lambda B & \lambda I_n \\ 0 & P_2 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 \\ \hdashline C & P_1 - \lambda C & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & P_0 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -I_n & \lambda I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{31}$$

It is readily checked, that $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ partioned as in (31) may alternatively be taken as an element of $\mathbb{G}_3(P)$ and of $\mathbb{G}_4(P)$ (e.g. $\eta = 2$, $\epsilon = 3$). In other words, $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_3(P)$.

The next theorem states that the phenomenon highlighted in Example 21 always holds. The main reason behind this fact is easily seen to be the blocksymmetric core part of pencils in double block-Kronecker ansatz spaces.

THEOREM 22 (Superpartition Property of $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$ and assume $\eta \leqslant \epsilon$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ implies $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+i}(P)$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 2\eta$.

For ease of notation in the proof of this theorem we introduce the following partioning of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathcal{L}_{11}^{(i)}(\lambda) & \mathcal{L}_{12}^{(i)}(\lambda) \\ \hline \mathcal{L}_{21}^{(i)}(\lambda) & \mathcal{L}_{22}^{(i)}(\lambda) \end{array}\right], \qquad \mathcal{L}_{11}^{(i)}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^{(\widetilde{\eta}+1)n \times (\widetilde{\epsilon}+1)n}, \quad \widetilde{\eta} = \eta + i, \widetilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon - i.$$

The condition $k = \eta + \epsilon + 1 = \widetilde{\eta} + \widetilde{\epsilon} + 1$ has to hold. For $i = 0$ this is the natural partition (9) considered so far; in particular, $\mathcal{L}_{11}^{(0)}(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda)$. Increasing i by one, the leading $(1,1)$-block of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is increased by one block row and decreased by one block column.

Proof. Due to our assumption $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$, the only thing that has to be guaranteed is $\Phi(\mathcal{L}_{11}^{(i)}(\lambda)) = \alpha P(\lambda)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k - 2\eta$. First of all, according to (27), $\mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda)$ may be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}_{11}(\lambda) = \left[\, B_{11}\ 0 \,\right](L_\epsilon \otimes I_n) + (L_\eta^T \otimes I_n)\left[\, B_{21}\ B_{22} \,\right] + \left[\, \Sigma_{\eta,P}^{\mathbb{DG}}\ \mathcal{R}_{\eta,P} \,\right]$$

with $B_2 = [\, B_{21}\ B_{22} \,]$ and $B_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta n \times (\eta+1)n}$. Then, we obtain that $\mathcal{L}_{11}^{(i)}(\lambda)$ may be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}_{11}^{(i)}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \dfrac{B_{11}}{C_{1,i}} & 0 \end{array}\right](L_{\widetilde{\epsilon}} \otimes I_n) + (L_{\widetilde{\eta}}^T \otimes I_n)\left[\begin{array}{c|c} B_{21} & B_{22,i} \\ \hline 0 & \alpha H_{\epsilon-\eta}^{(i)}(P) \end{array}\right] + \alpha \Omega_{\eta+i,P}(\lambda)$$

with the $(\widetilde{\eta}+1)n \times (\widetilde{\epsilon}+1)n$ matrix pencil $\Omega_{\eta+i,P}(\lambda)$

$$\Omega_{\eta+i,P}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \lambda P_k + P_{k-1} & \cdots & P_\epsilon & & & \\ & & \vdots & & & \\ & & P_{\epsilon-\eta} & & & \\ \hline & & P_{\epsilon-\eta-1} & & & \\ & & \vdots & & & \\ & & P_{\epsilon-\eta-i} & P_{\epsilon-\eta-i-1} & \cdots & P_0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{32}$$

Here, $\mathcal{H}^{(i)}_{\epsilon-\eta}(P)$ denotes the upper left $in \times (\epsilon-\eta-i)n$ submatrix of $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta}(P)$, $C_{1,i}$ the first in rows of C_1, i.e. $C_{1,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{in\times(\epsilon-\eta)n}$, and $B_{22,i}$ the matrix B_2 missing the last in colums, i.e. $B_{22,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times(\epsilon-\eta-i)n}$. Now, since $\Phi(\Omega_{\eta+i,P}(\lambda)) = P(\lambda)$ holds we obtain $\Phi(\mathcal{L}^{(i)}_{11}(\lambda)) = \alpha P(\lambda)$. □

REMARK 23. *According to Example 21 it is not suprising, that Theorem 22 holds. The property of a matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ being an element of $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ imposes several restrictions on the form of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$. In particular, whereas the bordering blocks in the 3×3 partioning as in Figure 1 underly the condition of having no contribution in one space and being completely reproducable in the other (see Theorem 15), the core part of the pencil has to be adequate for both spaces, $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and $\mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P)$. This lucky circumstance determines the (blocksymmetric) form of $C(\mathcal{L})$ completely as depicted in the picture below and, no matter how η and ϵ are chosen, guarantees that $\Phi(\mathcal{L}^{(i)}_{11}(\lambda)) = \alpha P(\lambda)$ always holds.*

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c|cccc|c}
P_{\mu+1} & P_\mu & P_{\mu-1} & P_{\mu-2} & \cdots & P_1 & P_0 \\
\hline
P_\mu & P_{\mu-1}-\lambda P_\mu & P_{\mu-2}-\lambda P_{\mu-1} & P_{\mu-3}-\lambda P_{\mu-2} & \cdots & P_0-\lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 \\
\cline{1-6}
P_{\mu-1} & P_{\mu-2}-\lambda P_{\mu-1} & P_{\mu-3}-\lambda P_{\mu-2} & P_{\mu-4}-\lambda P_{\mu-3} & & \iddots & \\
P_{\mu-2} & P_{\mu-3}-\lambda P_{\mu-2} & P_{\mu-4}-\lambda P_{\mu-3} & \cdots & \iddots & & \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \iddots & & & \\
P_1 & P_0-\lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & & & & \\
\cline{1-3}
P_0 & -\lambda P_0 & & & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{\textit{core part } C(\mathcal{L})}
\end{array}\right]$$

The next algorithm presents a procedure to reformulate a pencil from $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ as an element of $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+i+1}$ for all $i = 1,\dots,\lfloor\frac{\epsilon-\eta}{2}\rfloor$. This implies $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_{\eta+i}(P)$ for all $i = 2,\dots,k-2\eta-1$.

Algorithm 1: Shift-Procedure for Pencil Expressions
Let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i\lambda^i$ be an $n\times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon+\eta+1$ and assume $\eta \leqslant \epsilon$. In addition, let a matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ be given as in (27).

1. Choose any $i = 1,\dots,\lfloor\frac{\epsilon-\eta}{2}\rfloor$ and partition $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta}(P)$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta}(P) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\multicolumn{3}{c}{J_i(P)} \\
\hline
H_i(P) & \mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta-2i}(P) & 0 \\
\hline
\mathcal{H}_i(P) & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right].$$

2. Partition C_{11} as $C^{\mathcal{B}}_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & c_2 & \dots & c_{\epsilon-\eta}\end{bmatrix}$ with $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times n}$ and compute the matrices

$$\widetilde{B}^{(i)}_{11} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{matrix} B_{11} \\ \hline c^{\mathcal{B}}_1 \\ \vdots \\ c^{\mathcal{B}}_i \end{matrix} & 0_{(\eta+i+1)n\times in} \end{array}\right], \qquad \widetilde{C}^{(i)}_{21} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{matrix} c^{\mathcal{B}}_{(\epsilon-\eta)-i+1} \\ \vdots \\ c^{\mathcal{B}}_{\epsilon-\eta} \\ \hline C_{21} \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \mathcal{H}_i(P) \\ \\ 0_{\eta n\times in} \end{matrix} \end{array}\right],$$

and

$$\widetilde{C}^{(i)}_{11} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{matrix} c^{\mathcal{B}}_{i+1} \\ \vdots \\ c^{\mathcal{B}}_{(\epsilon-\eta)-i} \end{matrix} & H_i(P) \end{array}\right].$$

Note $\widetilde{B}^{(i)}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1+i)n\times(\eta+i)n}$, $\widetilde{C}^{(i)}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon-\eta-2i)n\times(\eta+i)n}$ and $\widetilde{C}^{(i)}_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+i)n\times(\eta+i)n}$.

3. Compute the matrix $\Omega_{\eta+i,P}(\lambda)$ from (32) and express $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ as

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} I_{\widetilde{(\eta+1)n}} & \widetilde{B}_{11}^{(i)} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \widetilde{C}_{11}^{(i)} & \alpha\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{\epsilon-\eta}}(P) \\ \hline 0 & \widetilde{C}_{21}^{(i)} & 0 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Omega_{\widetilde{\eta},P}(\lambda) & L_{\widetilde{\eta}}^T \otimes I_n \\ \hline L_{\widetilde{\epsilon}} \otimes I_n & 0 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{\widetilde{(\epsilon+1)n}} & 0 \\ \hline \widetilde{B}_2^{(i)} & \widetilde{C}_2^{(i)} \end{array}\right] \tag{33}$$

with $\widetilde{\eta} = \eta + i$, $\widetilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon - i$ and $\left[\widetilde{B}_2^{(i)} \quad \widetilde{C}_2^{(i)}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{cc} B_2 & C_2 \\ \hline 0_{in\times(\eta+1)n} & J_i(P)\ 0_{in\times\eta n} \end{array}\right]$.

Now the pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is an element of $\mathbb{DG}_{\widetilde{\eta+1}}(P)$. Notice that we did not formulate $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in terms of $\Pi^{\mathbb{DG}}_{\eta+i,P}(\lambda)$ as in (27). Although this is possible, it is easier (and seems more natural) to just use $\Omega_{\eta+i,P}(\lambda)$ which is directly available.[3]

We illustrate this procedure in the following example.

EXAMPLE 24. *Let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{7} P_i\lambda^i$ be an $n\times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) = 7$. Consider the matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ given below (with arbitrary $n\times n$ matrices $A, B, \ldots, K$)*

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{ccccc:c:c:c} \lambda P_7 + P_6 & P_5 & -A & -B & -C & -D & -E \\ 0 & P_4 & \lambda A + P_3 & \lambda B + P_2 & \lambda C + P_1 & \lambda D + P_0 & \lambda E \\ \hdashline -F & P_3 + \lambda F & P_2 - \lambda P_3 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 \\ \hdashline -G & P_2 + \lambda G & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & & \\ \hdashline -H & \lambda H + P_1 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & & & \\ -J & P_0 + \lambda J & -\lambda P_0 & & & & \\ -K & \lambda K & & & & & \end{array}\right].$$

This matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is an element of $\mathbb{DG}_2(P)$ since it can be expressed as

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc|c|cccc} I_n & & 0 & & & & \\ & I_n & 0 & & & & \\ \hline & & F & -P_3 & -P_2 & -P_1 & -P_0 \\ & & G & -P_2 & -P_1 & -P_0 & \\ & & H & -P_1 & -P_0 & & \\ & & J & -P_0 & & & \\ \hline & & K & & & & \end{array}\right] \Psi_1 \left[\begin{array}{cccccc|c} I_n & & & & & & \\ & I_n & & & & & \\ & & I_n & & & & \\ & & & I_n & & & \\ & & & & I_n & & \\ & & & & & I_n & \\ \hline 0 & 0 & A & B & C & D & E \end{array}\right],$$

with

$$\Psi_j = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \Omega_{j,P}(\lambda) & L_j^T \otimes I_n \\ \hline L_{6-j} \otimes I_n & 0 \end{array}\right].$$

For $i = 1$ we obtain according to Algorithm 2

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|cc|cc} I_n & & & 0 & 0 & & \\ & I_n & & 0 & 0 & & \\ & & I_n & F & 0 & & \\ \hline & & & G & -P_2 & -P_1 & -P_0 \\ & & & H & -P_1 & -P_0 & \\ \hline & & & J & -P_0 & & \\ & & & K & 0 & & \end{array}\right] \Psi_2 \left[\begin{array}{ccccc|cc} I_n & & & & & & \\ & I_n & & & & & \\ & & I_n & & & & \\ & & & I_n & & & \\ & & & & I_n & & \\ \hline 0 & 0 & A & B & C & D & E \\ 0 & 0 & -P_3 & -P_2 & -P_1 & -P_0 & \end{array}\right].$$

According to (33) this is the expression of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in the space $\mathbb{DG}_3(P)$. Now, since $\lfloor\frac{\epsilon-\eta}{2}\rfloor = 2$ we may also consider the case $i = 2$. Algorithm 2 gives in this case

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|ccc} I_n & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & I_n & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & I_n & & F & 0 & 0 \\ & & & I_n & G & 0 & 0 \\ \hline & & & & H & -P_1 & -P_0 \\ & & & & J & -P_0 & 0 \\ & & & & K & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right] \Psi_3 \left[\begin{array}{cccc|ccc} I_n & & & & & & \\ & I_n & & & & & \\ & & I_n & & & & \\ & & & I_n & & & \\ \hline 0 & 0 & A & B & C & D & E \\ 0 & 0 & -P_3 & -P_2 & -P_1 & -P_0 & \\ 0 & 0 & -P_2 & -P_1 & -P_0 & & \end{array}\right].$$

[3]However, having (33) we are certainly able to modify $\widetilde{B}_{11}^{(i)}$ and $\widetilde{B}_2^{(i)}$ appropriately to express $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is the form (27).

This is the expression of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ as an element of $\mathbb{DG}_4(P)$. Notice that, in this case, $\mathbb{DG}_4(P) = \mathbb{G}_4(P) \cap \mathbb{G}_4(P)$, so there are no additional restrictions for a pencil of $\mathbb{G}_4(P)$ for being an element of $\mathbb{DG}_4(P)$. This complies with the disappearance of the $\mathcal{H}$-block and the zero-blocks in (27).

The following observation is immediate.

COROLLARY 25 (Inclusion Property for $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ Spaces).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{DG}_1(P) \subsetneqq \mathbb{DG}_2(P) \subsetneqq \ldots \subsetneqq \mathbb{DG}_{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil}(P). \tag{34}$$

4.2 Blocksymmetric Pencils and the Spaces $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$

This section is dedicated to the basic study of blocksymmetric pencils in double block-Kronecker ansatz spaces. Blocksymmetric block-Kronecker pencils have already been considered in [4] whereas vector spaces of blocksymmetric pencils are investigted in [1] and [8]. For motivation, consider once more the matrix pencil $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ in (24).

REMARK 26. *Example 14 showed, in contrast to our experience with the classical double ansatz space $\mathbb{DL}(P)$, that not all matrix pencils in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ are blocksymmetric. Nevertheless, it is not hard to see, that the matrix pencil $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ in (24) may be symmetrized to*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{cc:c:ccc:c} \lambda P_6 + P_5 & \frac{1}{2}P_4 & A & C & -B & -I_n \\ \frac{1}{2}P_4 & P_3 & P_2 - \lambda A & P_1 - \lambda C & P_0 + \lambda B & \lambda I_n \\ \hdashline A & P_2 - \lambda A & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 \\ C & P_1 - \lambda C & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 \\ -B & P_0 + \lambda B & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -I_n & \lambda I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{35}$$

DEFINITION 27 (Blocksymmetric block-Kronecker Ansatz Space).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be a $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$ and assume $\eta \leqslant \epsilon$. Then we define

$$\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P) = \left\{ \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P) \;\middle|\; \mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}(\lambda)^{\mathcal{B}} \right\}. \tag{36}$$

As Example 21 immediately suggests, in general $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P) \neq \mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ holds. In fact, $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a proper subspace of $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ for $\eta > 0$ (see Theorem 29 below) and therefore a nowhere dense subset in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$.

REMARK 28. *To find or construct blocksymmetric pencils in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ several aspects have to be taken into account. As in the previous discussion, the matrix pencils will be partioned into a 3×3 block matrix as in Figure 1. First and foremost (35) reveals, that we have to take care of the bordering blocks in order to enforce pencils $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ on being blocksymmetric. Secondly, the upper left square diagonal block certainly has to be blocksymmetric as well. Thirdly, we do not have to take care of the core part of the pencil which is, for pencils in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$, blocksymmetric anyway. These conditions were taken into account in the following algorithm.*

Algorithm 2: Construction Procedure for Blocksymmetric Pencils
Let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i \lambda^i$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$.

1. Compute the matrices

$$\Sigma_{\eta,P}^{\mathbb{BG}}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda P_k + P_{k-1} & \frac{1}{2}P_{k-2} & & & & \\ \frac{1}{2}P_{k-2} & P_{k-3} & \frac{1}{2}P_{k-4} & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & \frac{1}{2}P_{\epsilon-\eta+3} & P_{\epsilon-\eta+2} & \frac{1}{2}P_{\epsilon-\eta+1} & \\ & & & \frac{1}{2}P_{\epsilon-\eta+1} & P_{\epsilon-\eta} \end{bmatrix} \tag{37}$$

and set $\Pi^{\mathbb{BG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix}\Sigma^{\mathbb{BG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & \mathcal{R}_{\eta,P}\end{bmatrix}$. Note that $\Sigma^{\mathbb{BG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{(\eta+1)n\times(\eta+1)n}$.

2. Compute the matrix

$$C_1 = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} C_{11} & \alpha\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta}(P) \\ \hline C_{21} & 0_{\eta n\times(\epsilon-\eta)n}\end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{\epsilon n\times\epsilon n} \tag{38}$$

with arbitrary matrices $C_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon-\eta)n\times\eta n}$ and $C_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times\eta n}$.

3. Choose an arbitrary matrix $B_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)n\times\eta n}$ and set

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix}B_{11} & 0_{(\eta+1)n\times(\epsilon-\eta)n}\end{bmatrix} \qquad C_2 = C_{21}^{\mathcal{B}} \qquad B_2 = \begin{bmatrix}B_{11}^{\mathcal{B}} & C_{11}^{\mathcal{B}}\end{bmatrix}. \tag{39}$$

4. Construct the $kn \times kn$ matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$:

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\eta+1)n} & B_1 \\ \hline 0 & C_1\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Pi^{\mathbb{BG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & L_\eta^T\otimes I_n \\ \hline L_\epsilon\otimes I_n & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & 0 \\ \hline B_2 & C_2\end{array}\right]. \tag{40}$$

The matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is explicitly given as

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} I_{(\eta+1)n} & B_{11} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & C_{11} & \alpha\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta} \\ \hline 0 & C_{21} & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Pi^{\mathbb{BG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & L_\eta^T\otimes I_n \\ \hline L_\epsilon\otimes I_n & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & & 0 \\ \hline B_{11}^{\mathcal{B}} & C_{11}^{\mathcal{B}} & C_{21}^{\mathcal{B}}\end{array}\right].$$

Since $\Sigma^{\mathbb{BG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda)$ is blocksymmetric by construction, (39) ensures the blocksymmetry of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in total. To this, remember that the core part of a pencil in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is always blocksymmetric. It is easily seen that the conditions (39) are not only sufficient but also necessary for $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in (40) to be blocksymmetric (therefore recall (35) and (24)).

THEOREM 29 (Characterization of $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be a $n\times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon+\eta+1$ and assume $\eta \leqslant \epsilon$. Then $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ having dimension

$$\dim\big(\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)\big) = k\eta n^2 + 1. \tag{41}$$

Any matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ may be characterized as

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} I_{(\eta+1)n} & B_{11} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & C_{11} & \alpha\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon-\eta} \\ \hline 0 & C_{21} & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c} \alpha\Pi^{\mathbb{BG}}_{\eta,P}(\lambda) & L_\eta^T\otimes I_n \\ \hline L_\epsilon\otimes I_n & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} I_{(\epsilon+1)n} & & 0 \\ \hline B_{11}^{\mathcal{B}} & C_{11}^{\mathcal{B}} & C_{21}^{\mathcal{B}}\end{array}\right] \tag{42}$$

with arbitrary matrices $B_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\eta+1)n\times\eta n}$, $C_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon-\eta)n\times\eta n}, C_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta n\times\eta n}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, unless $\eta = 0$, $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a proper subspace of both $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and $\mathbb{DG}_{k-\eta}(P)$.

The next results about $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ are immediate consequences of Theorem 17 and Corollary 25.

COROLLARY 30 (Linearization Condition for $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$).
Let $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ for a square and regular matrix polynomial $P(\lambda)$. If $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is given in the form (42) the following statements are equivalent:

1. *$\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$.*
2. *$P_0 \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R}), C_{21} \in \mathrm{GL}_{\eta n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$.*

Once again, the implication 2. $\Rightarrow$ 1. holds without the assumtion of regularity according to Theorem 6. Moreover, certainly Corollary 19 still holds. That is, whenever zero is not an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$, i.e. $P_0 \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$, almost every matrix pencil in $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ regardless whether $P(\lambda)$ is regular or singular. Moreover, the inclusion property from the previous section is still valid for blocksymmetric pencils.

LEMMA 31 (Inclusion Property for $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ Spaces).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{BG}_1(P) \subsetneqq \mathbb{BG}_2(P) \subsetneqq \ldots \subsetneqq \mathbb{BG}_{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil}(P). \tag{43}$$

To illustrate the construction procedure from Algorithm 3 consider the following simple example.

EXAMPLE 32. *Let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{7} P_i \lambda^i$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) = 7$. First consider the case $\eta = 1$ and $\epsilon = k - \eta - 1 = 5$. The construction procedure easily gives*

$$\mathcal{H}_4 = \begin{bmatrix} -P_3 & -P_2 & -P_1 & -P_0 \\ -P_2 & -P_1 & -P_0 & \\ -P_1 & -P_0 & & \\ -P_0 & & & \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{4n \times 4n}$$

and $\Pi_{1,P}^{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda P_7 + P_6 & \frac{1}{2}P_5 & 0_n & 0_n & 0_n & 0_n \\ \frac{1}{2}P_5 & P_4 & P_3 & P_2 & P_1 & P_0 \end{bmatrix}$. Choose $B_{11} = 0$, $C_{11} = 0$ and $C_{21} = I_n$. Then computing $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ from (40) with $\alpha = 1$ yields

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cccc:c} \lambda P_7 + P_6 & \frac{1}{2}P_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -I_n \\ \frac{1}{2}P_5 & P_4 & P_3 & P_2 & P_1 & P_0 & \lambda I_n \\ \hdashline 0 & P_3 & P_2 - \lambda P_3 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_2 & P_1 - \lambda P_2 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_1 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_0 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -I_n & \lambda I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{44}$$

which is indeed a blocksymmetric $7n \times 7n$ matrix pencil. Thus $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{BG}_2(P)$. Note that the choice of B_{11} and C_{11} has no influence on $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ for being a linearization. In fact, the regularity of P_0 and C_{21} are the decisive factors while choosing B_{11} and C_{11} to be singular matrices does not affect the linearization property of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ at all.
Now consider $\eta = 2$ and $\epsilon = k - \eta - 1 = 4$. Then

$$\mathcal{H}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -P_1 & -P_0 \\ -P_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}.$$

Now choose $C_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} -P_7 & -P_6 \\ -P_5 & -P_4 \end{bmatrix}$ and $C_{21} = \begin{bmatrix} -P_3 & -P_2 \\ -P_1 & -P_0 \end{bmatrix}$. The computation in (40) gives

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|cc:cc} \lambda P_7 + P_6 & \frac{1}{2}P_5 & 0 & P_7 & P_5 & P_3 & P_1 \\ \frac{1}{2}P_5 & P_4 & \frac{1}{2}P_3 & P_6 - \lambda P_7 & P_4 - \lambda P_5 & P_2 - \lambda P_3 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}P_3 & P_2 & P_1 - \lambda P_6 & P_0 - \lambda P_4 & -\lambda P_2 & -\lambda P_0 \\ \hdashline P_7 & P_6 - \lambda P_7 & P_1 - \lambda P_6 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 \\ P_5 & P_4 - \lambda P_5 & P_0 - \lambda P_4 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline P_3 & P_2 - \lambda P_3 & -\lambda P_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ P_1 & P_0 - \lambda P_1 & -\lambda P_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]$$

which is blocksymmetric. Therefore we have $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{BG}_3(P)$.

REMARK 33. *Consider $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ from the last example. $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ if and only if $\det(P_0) \neq 0$, whereas $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda)$ if and only if $\det(P_0), \det(P_1), \det(P_2) \neq 0$ (see Theorem 6). Neither the classical ansatz space approach (see [8]) nor the pure block-Kronecker pencils from [3] cover blocksymmetric pencils like these.*

5 The Placement of $\mathbb{L}_1(P)$ and $\mathbb{L}_2(P)$

In this section, we will derive the classical ansatz spaces $\mathbb{L}_1(P)$ and $\mathbb{L}_2(P)$ based on the block-Kronecker ansatz equation (8). For this purpose, we consider a matrix polynomial $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i \lambda^i$ of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) = k = \epsilon + \eta + 1$ and first of all assume $\eta = 0$. Now, taking any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$, any matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{G}_1(P)$ satisfies

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} v \otimes I_n & \begin{array}{c} 0_{n\times(k-1)n} \\ \hline I_{(k-1)n} \end{array} \end{array}\right] \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^{k-1} I_n \\ \vdots \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} = v \otimes \alpha P(\lambda). \tag{45}$$

Notice that equation (45) follows directly from the definition of $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and the premultiplication of (8) by the matrix

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{left}} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} v \otimes I_n & \begin{array}{c} 0_{n\times\epsilon n} \\ \hline I_{\epsilon n} \end{array} \end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{(\epsilon+1)n\times(\epsilon+1)n}.$$

By Theorem 4 we know, that every matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in $\mathbb{G}_1(P)$ may be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_n & B_1 \\ \hline 0 & C_1 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c} \alpha\Sigma_{0,P}(\lambda) \\ \hline L_{k-1}(\lambda) \otimes I_n \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_n & B_1 \\ \hline 0 & C_1 \end{array}\right] \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,0,P}(\lambda). \tag{46}$$

Combining the expression of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ from (46) with equation (45) we obtain that the matrix pencil

$$\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} v \otimes I_n & \begin{array}{c} 0_{n\times(k-1)n} \\ \hline I_{(k-1)n} \end{array} \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_n & B_1 \\ \hline 0 & C_1 \end{array}\right] \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,0,P}(\lambda) \tag{47}$$

$$= \left[\begin{array}{c|c} v \otimes I_n & \begin{array}{c} B_1^\star \\ \hline C_1^\star \end{array} \end{array}\right] \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,0,P}(\lambda) \tag{48}$$

with $B_1^\star = v_1 B_1$ and $C_1^\star = [\, v_2 \; v_3 \; \ldots \; v_k \,]^T \otimes B_1 + C_1$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)(\Lambda_{k-1} \otimes I_n) = v \otimes \alpha P(\lambda). \tag{49}$$

Due to the multiplication with $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$, the scalar $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ may be ignored until further notice (i.e. we set $\alpha = 1$). Then, equation (49) is just the well known (classical) ansatz equation (1) for the vector space $\mathbb{L}_1(P)$. Moreover, it is easily seen, that any pencil $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ of the form (48) with arbitrary matrices $B_1^\star$ and $C_1^\star$ satisfies (49) since

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} v \otimes I_n & \begin{array}{c} B_1^\star \\ \hline C_1^\star \end{array} \end{array}\right] \mathrm{Frob}_P(\lambda)(\Lambda_{k-1} \otimes I_n) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} v \otimes I_n & \begin{array}{c} B_1^\star \\ \hline C_1^\star \end{array} \end{array}\right] \big(e_1 \otimes P(\lambda)\big) = v \otimes P(\lambda)$$

as $\mathcal{F}_{1,0,P}(\lambda) = \mathrm{Frob}_P(\lambda)$. Now, verifying that (48) is essentially just a reformulation of [8, Thm. 3.5], we have derived an equivalent, but alternative description of $\mathbb{L}_1(P)$. In the context of orthogonal bases, this result was already obtained in [5].

Corollary 34 (Characterization of $\mathbb{L}_1(P)$).
Let $P(\lambda)$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree k. Then $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ satisfies the classical ansatz equation $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)(\Lambda_{k-1} \otimes I_n) = v \otimes P(\lambda)$ if and only if

$$\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda) = \big[\, (v \otimes I_n) \; \mathcal{Z} \,\big] \mathrm{Frob}_P(\lambda) \qquad \mathcal{Z} = \left[\begin{array}{c} B_1^\star \\ \hline C_1^\star \end{array}\right] \tag{50}$$

for some arbitrary matrix $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{kn\times(k-1)n}$.

The characterization in (50) together with Theorem 6 yields a very simple linearization condition for pencils in $\mathbb{L}_1(P)$ for regular matrix polynomials $P(\lambda)$, see [5, Cor. 2].

$\mathcal{P}$-Tableau

			P_k	0	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	0
		P_k	P_{k-1}	$-P_{k-2}$	$\cdots$	$-P_1$	$-P_0$
	$\iddots$	$\iddots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\iddots$	$\iddots$	
P_k	P_{k-1}	$\cdots$	P_2	$-P_1$	$-P_0$		
P_{k-1}	P_{k-2}	$\cdots$	P_1	$-P_0$			

Figure 3: $\mathcal{P}$-tableau corresponding to $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i \lambda^i$.

COROLLARY 35. *A matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda) \in \mathbb{L}_1(P)$ as in (50) is a strong linearization for $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i \lambda^i \in \mathbb{R}[\lambda]^{n\times n}$ with $P_k \neq 0$ if and only if $[\,(v \otimes I_n)\ \mathcal{Z}\,]$ is a regular matrix, i.e. rank$([\,(v \otimes I_n)\ \mathcal{Z}\,]) = kn$.*

In this case, the eigenvectors of $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ are exactly the eigenvectors of $\mathrm{Frob}_P(\lambda)$ (see [8, Thm. 3.8]).

A similar characterization of $\mathbb{L}_2(P)$ can be derived in an analogous way [5, Thm. 2]. Therefore, obtain $\mathbb{L}_2(P)$ consists of all matrix pencils $\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda)$ having the form

$$\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda) = \mathrm{Frob}_P^{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} v^T \otimes I_n \\ \hline \mathcal{Z} \end{bmatrix} \tag{51}$$

for some arbitrary matrix $\mathcal{Z} = [\,B_1^\star \mid C_1^\star\,] \in \mathbb{R}^{(k-1)n\times kn}$. These matrix pencils satisfy the (second) classical ansatz equation $(\Lambda_{k-1}^T \otimes I_n)\mathcal{L}^\star(\lambda) = v^T \otimes P(\lambda)$. Similar as before, (51) can be seen as a reformulation of [8, Lemma 3.11] and we obtain statements analogous to Corollaries 34 and 35.

5.1 Application: Computing the Standard Basis of $\mathbb{DL}(P)$

Consider the double ansatz space $\mathbb{DL}(P) = \mathbb{L}_1(P) \cap \mathbb{L}_2(P)$ (2). Any matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DL}(P)$ is blocksymmetric [6, Theorem 3.4]. In [6, Section 3.3] it is discussed how to compute the "standard basis pencils" in $\mathbb{DL}(P)$ corresponding to the standard basis $\{e_1, \ldots, e_k\} \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Certainly, computing the standard basis for $\mathbb{DL}(P)$, see [6, Sec. 3.3], for $\mathbb{DL}(P)$ from [6, Theorem 3.5] seems not to be a complicated task. However, regarding the expression (50) for matrix pencils in $\mathbb{L}_1(P)$, computing a particular blocksymmetric pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{L}_1(P)$ for some given ansatz vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$ breaks down to the computation of the corresponding matrix $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{kn\times(k-1)n}$. Thus, computing $\mathcal{Z}_j$ for $\mathcal{B}_j := [\,(e_j \otimes I_n)\ \mathcal{Z}_j\,]\mathrm{Frob}_P(\lambda) \in \mathbb{DL}(P)$ seems even simpler and does only require the computation of one $kn \times (k-1)n$ matrix instead of the set-up of two $kn \times kn$ matrices. In fact in was shown in [5] that $\mathcal{Z}$ has some blocksymmetric structure, too.

To this end, let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i \lambda^k$ be a square matrix polynomial of degree k. Using the matrix coefficients of $P(\lambda)$ we define the $\mathcal{P}$-Tableau corresponding to $P(\lambda)$ as in Figure 3. Now the matrices $\mathcal{Z}_i$ that correspond to a blocksymmetric matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \mathcal{B}_j(\lambda) \in \mathbb{L}_1(P)$ having the form (50) with ansatz vector e_j can easily be determined by the tableau. Therefore, regard the tableau as a $k \times 2(k-1)$ matrix and denote the left half by $\mathcal{J}_P$ and the right half by $\mathcal{H}_P$.

LEMMA 36. *Let $P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} P_i \lambda^k$ be a square matrix polynomial of degree k and $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{L}_1(P)$ with ansatz vector $v = e_i$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = [\,(e_i \otimes I_n)\ \mathcal{Z}_i\,]\mathrm{Frob}_P(\lambda) \in \mathbb{L}_2(P)$ if and only if*

$$\mathcal{Z}_i = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_P & i = 1 \\ \mathcal{J}_P(1:i, k-i:k-1) \oplus \mathcal{H}(i+1:k, 1:i+1) & 1 < i < k \\ \mathcal{J}_P & i = k \end{cases} \tag{52}$$

Proof. First observe that any matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{L}_1(P)$ may be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\lambda) &= \big[\,(v \otimes I_n)\ \mathcal{Z}\,\big]\mathrm{Frob}_P(\lambda) \\ &= v \otimes \Sigma_{0,P}(\lambda) + \mathcal{Z} L_{k-1}(\lambda) \\ &= \big[\,(v \otimes P_k)\ \mathcal{Z}\,\big]\lambda + \big(v \otimes \Sigma_{0,P}(0) + \mathcal{Z} L_{k-1}(0)\big) \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Now notice that (53) expresses $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in the form $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}_1\lambda + \mathcal{L}_0$ with two $kn \times kn$ matrices $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_0$. This form was mainly considered in [6]. Comparing X_m from [6, (3.8a)] with $\mathcal{Z}_m$ as defined in Lemma 36 and considering [6, Thm. 3.5] shows the statement. □

To illustrate Lemma 36 consider the following examples. Deviating from our notation, the polynomial coefficients in the example below are denoted $A, B, C, \ldots$ to highlight the similarity to [8, Table 1/2] and [6, Table 3.1/3.2].

EXAMPLE 37. *Let $P(\lambda) = A\lambda^2 + B\lambda + C$ be an $n \times n$ matrix polynomial of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) = 2$. Then the matrix $\mathcal{Z}$ in (50) has dimension $2n \times n$. Therefore, the $\mathcal{P}$-tableau has dimension $2n \times 2n$ and is easily computed as*

A	0
B	$-C$

and we have $\mathcal{Z}_1 = \mathcal{H}_P$ and $\mathcal{Z}_2 = \mathcal{J}_P$. Now let $P(\lambda) = A\lambda^3 + B\lambda^2 + C\lambda + D$ be of degree $\deg(P(\lambda)) = 3$. Then the matrix $\mathcal{Z}$ in (50) has dimension $3n \times 2n$ and the $\mathcal{P}$-tableau dimension $3n \times 4n$. It is given by

0	A	0	0
A	B	$-C$	$-D$
B	C	$-D$	0

The three structures according to formula (52) are

0	A	0	0
A	B	$-C$	$-D$
B	C	$-D$	0

0	A	0	0
A	B	$-C$	$-D$
B	C	$-D$	0

0	A	0	0
A	B	$-C$	$-D$
B	C	$-D$	0

for e_1, e_2 and $e_3 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ respectively. Therefore, any matrix pencil $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ in $\mathbb{DL}(P)$ with ansatz vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ can be expressed as $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = [\,(v \otimes I_n)\ \mathcal{Z}\,]\mathrm{Frob}_P(\lambda)$ with

$$\mathcal{Z} = v_1 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -C & -D \\ -D & 0 \end{bmatrix} + v_2 \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ B & 0 \\ 0 & -D \end{bmatrix} + v_3 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A & B \\ B & C \end{bmatrix}.$$

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we introduced a family of equations for matrix pencils that turn out to be a new source of linearizations for square and rectangular matrix polynomials $P(\lambda)$. We showed that these equations define vector spaces $\mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P)$ of matrix pencils in which almost every pencil is a strong linearization regardless whether $P(\lambda)$ is regular or singular. These spaces were named "block-Kronecker ansatz spaces" since they contain the entire family of block-Kronecker pencils as introduced in [3] and share important properties with the "ansatz spaces" from [8]. We showed that the intersection of two block-Kronecker ansatz spaces $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P) = \mathbb{G}_{\eta+1}(P) \cap \mathbb{G}_{k-\eta}(P)$ is never empty and contains a proper subspace $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ of blocksymmetric matrix pencils. Still almost every pencil is a strong linearization in either $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ given the case that zero is not an eigenvalue of $P(\lambda)$. Moreover, we presented a simple approach to the construction of matrix pencils in $\mathbb{DG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and $\mathbb{BG}_{\eta+1}(P)$ and showed that these spaces form nested sequences of vector spaces for increasing choices of η. We presented our results assuming the fields underlying our derivations are the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$. However, we expect that most of the concepts immediately extend to arbitrary fields $\mathbb{F}$.

Certainly, via the multiplication of change of basis matrices, block-Kronecker ansatz equations may be defined for other polynomial bases as well (see, e.g., [7] for a clever generalization of block-Kronecker pencils for the Chebyshev basis). Moreover, we expect that the conceptual ideas presented here may even be formulated in the abstract framework of dual bases (i.e. "strong block minimal bases pancils", see [3] for more information). A deeper study in this direction is, at least to the authors opinion, likely to give attractive novel results on how Fiedler pencils, block-Kronecker pencils and ansatz spaces interact.

References

[1] M. Bueno, F. Dopico, S. Furtado, and M. Rychnovsky, *Large vector spaces of block-symmetric strong linearizations of matrix polynomials.*, Linear Algebra Appl., 477 (2015), pp. 165–210.

[2] F. De Terán, F. M. Dopico, and D. S. Mackey, *Linearizations of singular matrix polynomials and the recovery of minimal indices*, Electron. J. Linear Algebra, 18 (2009), pp. 371–402.

[3] F. Dopico, P. Lawrence, J. Perez, and P. Van Dooren, *Block kronecker linearizations of matrix polynomials and their backward errors*, MiMS EPrint 2016.34, Manchester Institute for Mathematical Sciences, The University of Manchester, UK, 2016, (2016).

[4] H. Fassbender, J. Perez, and N. Shayanfar, *Symmetric and skew-symmetric block-kronecker linearizations*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01766, (2016).

[5] H. Fassbender and P. Saltenberger, *On vector spaces of linearizations for matrix polynomials in orthogonal bases*, arXiv:1609.09493, (2016).

[6] N. J. Higham, D. S. Mackey, N. Mackey, and F. Tisseur, *Symmetric linearizations for matrix polynomials.*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 29 (2006), pp. 143–159.

[7] P. Lawrence and J. Perez, *Constructing strong linearizations of matrix polynomials expressed in the Chebyshev basis*, MIMS EPrint 2016.12, Manchester Institute for Mathematical Sciences, The University of Manchester, UK, 2016.

[8] D. S. Mackey, N. Mackey, C. Mehl, and V. Mehrmann, *Vector spcaes of linearizations for matrix polynomials*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 28 (2006), pp. 1029–1051.